	Case 3:06-cr-00063-LRH-RAM Document 34 Filed 06/11/08 Page 1 of 2
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7	DISTRICT OF NEVADA
8	* * * *
9	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) 3:06-cr-00063-LRH-RAM
10	Plaintiff,) ORDER
11	vs. ORDER
12	RODNEY LAUDERDALE,
13	Defendant.
14	
15	Before the court is a letter/motion to the court by the Defendant (#33) in which he seeks
16	relief to adjust the payment schedule of the restitution order entered by the court at sentencing.
17	The court will treat it as a motion. This motion apparently was prompted by the court's previous
18	order in this matter (#31).
19	In this case, the judgment from sentencing provides, in pertinent part, as follows:
20	Restitution Obligation - The defendant shall make restitution in the amount of NINETEEN THOUSAND ONE HUNDRED NINETY
21	FOUR DOLLARS (\$19,194.00) pursuant to a payment schedule to be determined by the probation officer. While of [sic] supervised
22	release, restitution shall be paid monthly at the rate of no less than ten percent (10%) of gross income, subject to an adjustment by the
23	Court based upon the ability to pay.
24	The victims' losses as a result of Defendant's robberies were sizable and the court
25	concludes that the existing restitution order should continue. In his letter/motion, Lauderdale
26	indicates that he can make "minimum acceptable imbursements (sic) of \$25.00 per quarter"
27	while he is in prison.
28	///

Case 3:06-cr-00063-LRH-RAM Document 34 Filed 06/11/08 Page 2 of 2

The court defers to the sound judgment and policies of the Bureau of Prisons. Subject to such deferral, and good cause appearing, It is hereby recommended to the Bureau of Prisons that Defendant's payment schedule, while he is in prison on the sentence imposed herein, shall be at a rate of no less than ten percent (10%) of his gross income or Twenty-five Dollars (\$25.00) per quarter, whichever amount is greater. Upon his release from prison, his restitution obligation during supervised release shall be reinstated to the terms and conditions originally imposed by the court at sentencing. Defendant's motion (#33) is therefore DENIED IN PART and GRANTED IN PART as reflected by this disposition. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED this 11th day of June, 2008. Flsihe LARRY R. HICKS UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE